



B6

U.S. Department of Justice  
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identification data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy.

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536



File: EAC 99 185 52718 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: 11 MAR 2002

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]  
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:  
[Redacted]

Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

*Robert P. Wiemann*  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The employment-based preference visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. The director's decision to deny the petition was affirmed by the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner on a motion to reopen. The motion will be granted. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is a restaurant. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a specialty cook. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification approved by the Department of Labor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the financial ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage as of the filing date of the visa petition. The Associate Commissioner affirmed this determination on appeal.

On motion, counsel submits a statement and additional evidence.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

8 C.F.R. 204.5(g)(2) states in pertinent part:

*Ability of prospective employer to pay wage.* Any petition filed by or for an employment-based immigrant which requires an offer of employment must be accompanied by evidence that the prospective United States employer has the ability to pay the proffered wage. The petitioner must demonstrate this ability at the time the priority date is established and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. Evidence of this ability shall be either in the form of copies of annual reports, federal tax returns, or audited financial statements.

Eligibility in this matter hinges on the petitioner's ability to pay the wage offered as of the petition's filing date, which is the date the request for labor certification was accepted for processing by any office within the employment system of the Department of Labor. Matter of Wing's Tea House, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the petition's filing date is January 9, 1998. The beneficiary's salary as stated on the labor certification is \$11.47 per hour or \$23,857.60 per annum.

The Associate Commissioner affirmed the director's decision to deny the petition, noting that the petitioner had not submitted evidence

of its ability to pay the proffered wage as of the filing date of the petition.

On motion, the petitioner reiterates his argument that:

The amount of \$27,000 reflected in the 1999 federal tax return includes \$16,450 paid to the part time cooks who will be replaced by the alien as the regular cook. The alien will be more efficient and consistent in reporting for work and his services are eagerly awaited by us.

As noted by the Associate Commissioner:

These funds were not retained by the petitioner for future use. Instead, these funds were expended on compensating workers and therefore not readily available for payment of the beneficiary's salary in 1998. Further, the petitioner has not documented the positions, duties and termination of these workers who performed the duties of the proffered position. If they performed other kinds of work, then the beneficiary could not have replaced them as suggested by counsel.

The petitioner further argues that:

Besides the restaurant has been operating only four days a week because of the absence of a regular cook. If we have the services of the alien as a fulltime cook the restaurant can be open seven days a week and the income will increase proportionately making it certain that the proffered wage can be paid.

The petitioner's argument that the beneficiary's employment will result in more income for the business is noted. The petitioner does not explain, however, the basis for such a conclusion. For example, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary will replace less productive workers, transform the nature of the petitioner's operation, or increase the number of customers on the strength of his reputation. Consequently, the Service is unable to take the potential earnings to be generated by the beneficiary's employment into consideration.

Based on the evidence submitted, it cannot be found that the petitioner had sufficient funds available to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage at the time of filing the application for alien employment certification as required by 8 C.F.R. 204.5(g)(2).

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

**ORDER:** The Associate Commissioner's decision of April 2, 2001, is affirmed. The petition is denied.